

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/016,291 | SHPEISMAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Apu M Mofiz | 2165 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Tom Van Zandt.

(3) _____.

(2) Apu M Mofiz.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 February 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1,5,6,11,16,21,26

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Applicant and the Examiner agreed to insert "computer implemented" in the preamble of independent claims and adding "and forwarding a request for new memory and the live reference information to a compiler concurrently" to claims 1,6,21 and 26 to overcome any possible 101 rejection. The Applicant and the Examiner also agreed to fix any other minor informalities with an Examiner's amendment..